

REMARKS

The Rejections Under 35 USC § 112

The Office Action alleges that the term “double sacks” in claim 14 is unclear and confusing. The specification on page 1, third paragraph, clearly describes what are double sacks. More information is provided on the rest of page 1 and also on page 2.

The Rejections Under 35 USC § 103

The Office Action combines US ‘547 and US ‘437 and alleges that the combination of these references renders obvious the claimed invention.

The Office Action admits that US ‘547 does not teach one or more flexible outer laser-inactive support layers which can be or are separated, which is characterized as readily separable by the Office Action. Nothing in US ‘547 teaches or suggests that the invention taught therein should be modified. Instead, this reference clearly teaches only embodiments where the label is multilayered and contains a protective film. See, for example, the abstract.

Removing the protective film is contrary to the teachings of US ‘547. This is especially clear in view of the disclosure on column 3, lines 34-35, where removal of the protective film is characterized as an “undesired alteration.”

The secondary reference, US 437 describes a different film system where in one of the embodiments, as correctly pointed out the Office Action, a top cover layer can be detached. Nothing in this reference teaches or suggests using such a removable cover layer in a system other than disclosed therein, and especially not in a system where the removal of the protective film is characterized as an “undesired alteration.”

Various dependent claims are rejected with the additional citation of references. These additional references do not cure the deficiencies of the first two references. Thus, for at least the reasons discussed above, the rejections should be withdrawn.

A new claim is added to an embodiment where the laser-markable flexible support unit is or is part of a double sack. Such is not taught or suggested by the references.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with this response or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-3402.

Respectfully submitted,



Csaba Henter, Reg. No. 50,908

Brion P. Heaney, Reg. No. 32,542

Attorneys for Applicants

MILLEN, WHITE, ZELANO & BRANIGAN, P.C.

Arlington Courthouse Plaza 1

2200 Clarendon Boulevard, Suite 1400

Arlington, VA 22201

Direct Dial: 703-812-5331

Facsimile: 703-243-6410

Attorney Docket No.:MERCK-2970

Date: **June 19, 2006**

K:\MERCK\2000 - 2999\2970\REPLY JUNE 06.DOC